2018-2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2018 CRSM)

	Questions	**Answers**
1	I am interested in responding to the CRSM-RFA 2018 and have a question about what comprises co-requisite models. Specifically, I'm part of a team at a University who are developing an inclusive postsecondary program for young adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities. In short, this will be a certificate-based program for students who audit University coursework and participate in on-campus activities to improve their employment outcomes. There are 100+ programs across the country at other institutions of higher education, though I'm not sure if this program model constitutes a co-requisite model. Can you please advise?	The CRSM-2018 RFA, Section 3.3 outlines student eligibility: "Students eligible to be served through the CRSM-2018 must be high school complete but not college ready in at least one subject area of mathematics, reading and/or writing (TEC, Chapter 51, Subchapter F-1, Texas Success Initiative [TSI])." The corequisite model used in this RFA is defined in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 4, Subchapter C, Section 4.53(7) as an instructional model where the underprepared student is co-enrolled in both the college-level course and developmental education course/intervention in the related subject matter in the same semester, whereby the developmental education component is directly aligned to the college-level course and is designed to support students' success in the college-level course. The developmental education courses/interventions usable under this grant program are designed for TSI purposes, are listed and described in the *Lower Division Academic Course Guide Manual* (ACGM), and must be reported using the appropriate ACGM CIP codes. Student enrollment in college-level coursework for audit purposes would not qualify as corequisite models under this grant program.
2	Are we supposed to submit, in the proposal, two separate budget forms, one for the initial award of up to $100,000, and a separate one for the projected funding based on completions?	No. Applicants are asked to submit only one budget for the initial award of up to $100,000, using the template in Appendix E. Note this template does include a line item amount based on your anticipated completions (see Appendix F for applicable worksheet). Applicants interested in additional, specific guidance on calculating anticipated completions are invited to attend an optional **Budget Webinar** on Thursday, June 7, 2018, 2:00-3:00 p.m.(CT) (webinar will be recorded; login information is forthcoming and will be emailed to all Applicants who submitted a "Notice of Intent")
3	Would you please confirm the deadline to submit the Notice of Intent for the 2018 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (CRSM-2018)? I see there are two different dates listed, and just want to verify that the deadline will be May 25th.	The correct dates for the CRSM-2018 RFA are as follows and outlined in Addendum 1 (see http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=249E8964-A5D1-20B1-4FB869D0F46163A6): May 25, 2018 - Notice of Intent Deadline June 8, 2018 - Inquiry Deadline June 22, 2018 - Application Deadline June 25, 2018 - Confirmation of Application Receipt by THECB On or around July 16, 2018 - THECB Announces Grant Awards Upon Execution of Contract - Grant Period Begins
4	I'd like to confirm that the Notice of Intent deadline was May 11th. The email was received late afternoon on May 10th. Is there any flexibility on submitting the intent?	Please see response to Question 2 above.
5	Will you please clarify if the Notice of Intent for the 2018 College Readiness and Success Models is an absolute requirement? In other words, if one was not submitted by the May 11th deadline, is it too late for an institution to apply?	Please see response to Question 2 above for the correct dates for the CRSM-2018 RFA. Interested applicants have until May 25, 2018, 5:00 p.m. (CT) to submit a Notice of Intent. The Notice of Intent is required.

2018-2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2018 CRSM)

	Questions	Answers
6	We are looking for answers to the following and thank you in advance for the information: 1. Are completion funding payments processed after each "Completion Certification Statement" is submitted per Appendix A, or is the aggregate completion funding released at the end of the award? 2. RFA section 10.5 states that we should "indicate matching funds and in-kind services" supporting the project in the budget narrative. Does this mean in Appendix E? Also, if we include matching/in-kind costs, is that only for the purposes of calculating our request/award? Or will we be required to track and report exact matching/in-kind costs to THECB? 3. RFA section 10.5 states that applicants will submit Appendix E "based on the initial funding of up to $100,000." We just want to confirm—does this mean our proposed budget will not include proposing how we will use completion funds awarded after completion certifications? 4. RFA section 10.6 states that we must "provide a budget narrative outlining how the projected funds received for completions will be used in alignment with Rider 37." Does this refer to the budget narrative in Appendix E that we submit with the application on 6/22? Is this submitted with the application or only in the final report referred to? 5. RFA section 10.6 states that funds will be used in alignment with Rider 37 in Appendix C. Appendix C contains Rider 33. Which Rider is applicable or are both? 6. RFA section 10.6 states that our final report will include a budget narrative "including a summary of how [completion] funding will continue to be used." Does this mean that completion funding can be expended after August 31, 2020? 7. RFA section 10.6 states that we must submit Appendix G, the Completion Funding Calculation Worksheet, with our application. In the application forms, the tables in this appendix are already filled in as an example. Do we duplicate these tables and overwrite the content to project our completion funding? 8. RFA section 10.7 states "Minimally, one goal will address each of the following areas: Advising, Faculty Development, and Corequisite Model Scaling." Does this mean there is one goal with these as its three activities/strategies? Or does it mean of our three to six proposed goals, three of them will be focused on each of these three areas? 9. RFA section 11.5 states that "All funding must be expended by August 31, 2020." Does this include completion funds or only the initial $50-$100K? 10. RFA section 11.6 states that we may apply for a one-year extension if successful. Are both no-cost extensions and extensions with additional funding possible types of extensions we can apply for?	**1.** Completion funding payments are processed after each Completion Certification Statement and remitted to the Grantee within 30 business days. **2.** As described in RFA Section 10.5, the budget narrative is a detailed description that is provided in addition to Appendix E and supports the strategies identified in the line items in Appendix E. Matching and In-kind costs should be accurate and tracked locally for audit purposes. **3.** Yes, the proposed budget (Appendix E) is required for the initial funding up to $100,000 only. Completion funding must be tracked locally to ensure it is used only for the same purposes outlined in the RFA and Rider 33 (see Appendix C). Additional guidance regarding tracking and use of completion funding will be addressed in the Budget Webinar (see Question 6 for more details on the Budget Webinar). **4.** The budget narrative described in Section 10.6 is a required component of the application and must be submitted along with Appendix E on or before the application due date of June 22, 2018, 5 p.m. (CT). **5.** The referral to Appendix C in Section 10.6 is correct; however, the correct number for the applicable Rider is 33, not 37. **6.** Once funding based on completions is remitted to an institution, it may be held locally until it is fully expended, provided it is used for purposes outlined in the RFA, Rider 33, and the contract. An institution may forward locally any unused completion funding beyond August 31, 2020 until it is fully expended. **7.** An applicant may zero-out the examples provided in the MS Word copy of the Appendix G provided on the CRSM-2018 website via the Application Forms link. **8.** The latter is correct: of an applicant's three to six proposed goals, one of them will be focused on each of these three areas. **9.** The statement applies only to the initial funding of up to $100,000. **10.** Yes, both extension requests are possible; additional funding is based on grantee performance and available funding.
7	SECTION 3.1 states that eligible applicants are Texas institutions of higher education (IHEs), but in Appendix B, the "definition" of an applicant says "community college or public technical institution". As a regional University, my school qualifies as an IHE, but not as a community college or technical institution. We are very interested in this opportunity, so I'm hopeful that we qualify as an IHE. Would you please let me know if we do, indeed, qualify?	1. Section 3.1 of the RFA is correct: An eligible applicant is a Texas public institution of higher education. Both Texas public community/technical colleges and universities are eligible to apply. 2. Yes, regional universities are eligible to apply.

	2018-2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2018 CRSM)	
	Questions	**Answers**
8	We, at a multi campus College, are debating whether or not we should submit as a single institution or separately. Do you know if we are allowed to submit as separate institutions? I know doing so will decrease our chances of receiving the grant, but I thought it would be good to know our options.	With regard to determining whether an institution of higher education applies for the CRSM-2018 grant as a separate campus within a system or applies as a system, THECB recommends to follow the same protocol as for CBM reporting. If a college system reports through CBM as one system, then the college system should submit one application. If the separate campuses within a system report separately through CBM, then the separate campuses, as many as are interested, should apply. Note if a separate campus within a system applies, it will need to ensure that it has the requisite support to meet contract, data, advising, and other requirements needed for a successful application.
9	We, at a multi campus College, are debating whether or not we should submit as a single system or separately as campuses. Could you let us know if we are allowed to submit as separate campuses?	See previous response.
10	how would applying and possibly receiving this new grant be affected (or would it?) by the no-cost extension of any existing CRSM grants which extends through the end of the Fall 2018 semester?	Application for and receipt of this new grant will not affect any current CRSM contracts or grantees. It should be noted, however, that any completions submitted for the CRSM-2018 application must be separate from and in addition to completions considered for current CRSM contracts.
11	Can one application address at least one subject area of mathematics and at least one subject area of integrated reading/writing?	Yes.
12	1. Does a Title III/V Eligibility Waiver count as documentation to waive the required 10% cost share? 2. Is a letter of transmittal required? It is listed as a required document in Appendix I: Scoring Rubric (page 37). Is this the same as the letter requesting the THECB's consideration of exceptions? Additionally, is the letter requesting the THECB's consideration of exceptions required? Or should it only be included if the Application is requesting exemptions?	**1.** Yes, a Title III/V Eligibility Waiver counts as documentation to waive the required 10% cost share. **2.** Reference in Appendix I (p. 37) to "Transmittal Letter" should be omitted, as it is no longer an application requirement. The Attachment referenced in Section 10.8 is not required and should be submitted only if the Applicant is requesting the THECB's consideration of exceptions.
13	For the Appendix H program evaluation plan table, can you clarify THECB's interpretation of Expected Outcomes and Measures of Success? Should expected outcomes be presented as statements of change (e.g., a percent increase or decrease)? Should measures of success be presented as targets (e.g., a number or percentage achieved)? Or is the entire table more so dependent on our internal definitions of these column header terminologies?	Measures of Success of strategies and initiatives can be expressed both quantitatively (e.g., increases/decreases in numbers/percentages) and qualitatively (e.g., satisfaction surveys, narrative analysis of focus groups), based on the identified goal. Quantitative goals should include both numbers and percentages as targets expected to be achieved as a result of the strategy/intiative.
14	• Could we classify ourselves as having "experience delivering corequisite models" per 1.2.1—and include success data—if our model did not meet the exact requirements of HB 2223? For example, if we did offer sequential (8+8) courses, but were awarding grades after the first 8-week (DE) course instead of only after the CL course, would this data be considered relevant to our application or not? • If our prior corequisite model success data goes back less than one year, can we consider ourselves as having "experience delivering corequisite models" per 1.2.1?	**1.** If the 8x8 model described required that the student had to pass the first 8 weeks (DE course) before the student was allowed to enroll and participate in the second 8 weeks (college course), then that model is considered an example of acceleration but not corequisite. If this model reflects your institution's experience, then it would be recommended to apply as an institution with limited or no experience delivering corequisite models. **2.** When referring to corequisite models, we are considering the HB 2223 definition. Data going back less than one year would be considered as "limited" experience.

	2018-2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2018 CRSM)	
	Questions	**Answers**
15	Is hiring an academic coach at 50% FTE an allowable expense?	A successful application will list all grant-funded personnel and a description of their roles and responsibilities supporting the CRSM strategies and initiatives. The explanation should justify the percentage of FTE proposed to be covered via grant funds, as well as a plan on how the FTE funding will be evaluated and sustained.
16	1. Will you please define and tell us where to locate "Course Verification Forms" and "Completion Certification Statements" as listed in 11.21.3? 2. Do allowable costs include computers or furniture?	**1.** Templates for course verification forms and completion certification statements will be provided to awarded applicants at the beginning of each enrollment period. **2.** Under the Uniform Grant Management Standards, computers and furniture are allowable expenses if justifiable and approved by the THECB.
17	Just a quick clarification question regarding the budget. Is the initial funding (up to $100,000) the total for a two year period or up to $100,000 per year for two years?	The initial funding of up to $100,000 is for the entire grant period of two years, not per year.
18	For this grant program, should we focus our project on only one subject (Math or English) or can we focus on two subjects (Math and English)? If we can focus the project on two subjects, would you like Appendix G as a total of both the subject areas or broken down by each subject area separately?	An institution can choose to focus one (math or IRW) or both subjects (math and IRW). In the case where an Institution chooses to focus on both subjects (math and IRW), Appendix G should be broken down by each subject area for each semester.
19	This opportunity was just recently brought to my attention and I note that the Notice of Intent to Apply deadline has already passed. Any possibility that our college could still participate?	No, the approved dates for the RFA must be adhered to. Institutions that did not submit or properly submit an Intent to Apply are not eligible to submit an application in response to this RFA.
20	I am following up regarding receiving our Institutional Profile linked to our DEPS. Can you tell me when I should be looking for this?	The contact listed in the Notice of Intent will receive the Institution's DEPS profile by Friday, June 1, 2018.
21	Are 1) Tutoring and / or 2) Supplemental Instruction considered as Allowable Costs?	Yes. Under this opportunity, tutoring and supplemental instruction are allowable costs provided the initiatitves are directly related to accomplishing the goals this RFA.
22	When will the DEPS Institutional Profile be sent out?	Please see response for question #20 above.
23	We would like to verify the application deadline for the RFA 781-18-20109 CRSM-2018 There are two application deadlines one on the form for June 8,2018 at 5:00CT and on the website for • Application Deadline: June 22, 2018 at 5:00 PM C.S.T. Please advise for the correct deadline.	Please see response for question #3 above.
24	We are trying to locate the application form for the CRSM RFA which is due on June 22. However we are unable to access the webpage for that particular grant. Please advise.	THECB recently upgraded its website, which may have temporarily affected access to RFA. Full access to grant information has been restored: http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=EDCAFAFE-D542-11E7-A03300505694284C

	2018-2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2018 CRSM)	
	Questions	**Answers**
25	The RFP does not specify the length or other parameters for the timeline (page 12) that is required for the application. Does THECB want a task/activity timeline type of chart, for example?	An applicant's proposed timeline may include the level of detail as the applicant deems appropriately reflects its program. As noted in section 10.4, final timelines will be negotiated between THECB and Awarded Applicants.
26	The Request for Application states in section 3.4.1.2 "If the responses no longer reflect current implementation . . . , then the Applicant should make appropriate changes to its Institutional Profile. . ." • Should we submit the revised Institutional Profile as an appendix? • If we are in the process of making changes that go into effect F '18, do we indicate that, or only changes that have already been implemented since the last submission? Oversight of this process has shifted, and we have noticed some discrepancies in the Institutional Profile. Do we correct those?	**1.** The following guidance is provided regarding the DEPS institutional profile: Additional Guidance Regarding the DEPS Institutional Profile: - If no changes are made to the Institutional Profile, submit a MS Word file of the Institutional Profile received with no changes **as an attachment** when the completed Application is submitted. - Any changes made to the Institutional Profile MUST be completed utilizing TRACK CHANGES in MS Word. o If changes are made to the Institutional Profile, submit a MS Word file of the Institutional Profile with TRACK CHANGES enabled showing "All Markup" **as an attachment** when the completed Application is submitted. **2.** Changes that have been finalized but do not become effective until fall 2018 should be noted and included in the institution's response.
27	Is the initial funding ($50,000-$100,000) to be used to cover one year's expenditures or both years'? May the request be submitted for $100,000 per year?	Your institution may expend the initial funding in one or two years. However, the initial funding request is for the entire grant period, not per year. Please see also response to Question 17.
28	I am interested in submitting a proposal for the RFA no. 781-18-20109, College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (CSRM-2018). The webpage http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=EDCAFAFE-D542-11E7-A03300505694284C States that the close date for the RFA is 6/22 while the pdf copy states that it is June 8th. Could you please confirm the date of submission for me? Also, we did not realize the date of notice of intent. We were carried away by the date published on the webpage "June 22, 2018". I would appreciate if we can still submit the proposal.	The application due date of June 22, 2018 is outlined in Addendum #1. An institution must have submitted a Notice of Intent by the May 25, 2018 deadline in order to submit an application.
29	The RFP does not specify the length or other parameters for the timeline (page 12) that is required for the application. Does THECB want a task/activity timeline type of chart, for example?	Please see response to Question 25. Length and other parameters of timeline are not specified and are therefore at the discretion of the institution.

	Questions	Answers
30	• Will we have to report on our annual Outcomes as stated in the evaluation plan? Or will we be reporting only on the Measures of Success? • Can you give an example of what is considered an acceptable Activity, its Measure of Success, and its Annual Outcome? Is this an acceptable example? The activity is to create engaging classrooms including technology; the measure of success is that 100% of faculty receive training in the use of new technology for co-requisite classes; and the outcome is that faculty become proficient in the use of technology in all co-requisite DE/CL courses. • What is a better example of an Annual Outcome related to an activity of having faculty internally train advisors: "Advisors are more effective in the corequisite advising process" or "The self-reported satisfaction rate with advising DE students increased from 25% to 90% of all advisors"? Or are both acceptable? • Does the "Data Collection" column in the evaluation plan refer to data that supports the Measures of Success, Annual Outcomes, or both? • In regards to section 10.3.3., do we have to demonstrate that we have a person or persons specially appointed to do this for this grant? If we have an existing mechanism used at the college by which this can be accomplished, is that acceptable? Will we be asked to provide names and reports of these activities throughout the grant period? • For the DEPS profile (survey), the purpose is mostly to update questions related to the description of the model(s) we will be using as of Fall 2018, correct? If any parts of the report were tied to a specific time frame (for example Fall 2017 data), can we leave that information as it was?	**1**. Requirements for reporting evaluation plan outcomes… **2.** The example provided is acceptable. We also recommend including how "proficiency in the use of technology" has been assessed. The assessment can be either qualficative, quantitative, or both. **3.** the second statement with actual measures is the preferred example (see also response to previous question). **4.** Data collection refers to .... **5.** A specific person(s) must be identified to address 10.3.3. The identified person will oversee the process or mechanism used to address 10.3.3, whether it is new or existing. The person is responsible for ensure 10.3.3 is appropriately addressed to ensure success of the grant initiatives. The awarded applicant should be prepared to provide reports/data applicable to the grant initiatives as requested. **6.** Yes, questions should be updated to reflect model(s) that will be employed starting fall 2018. Any data not yet available should be left as is.
31	I see in the RFA section 10.3.6 that the Program Director may receive up to 5% each year or 10% of the total grant award. In Appendix E (Proposed Budget Form) the first section (10.6.1) includes Project Director and Co-Director. May the Project Director and Co-Director each receive 10% of the total grant award, or is the maximum of 10% for them to split? If the Project Director receives 10%, can the Co-Director receive anything? If so, how much? Please clarify.	Only the salary for the Project Director is limited to 5% each year or 10% of total grant award. Other positions such as the Project Co-director are not limited in terms of salary and should reflect the percentage of FTE for grant-related activities.
32	I have a few questions about the grant. We are in the process of working on the RFA. Our grant director would like some guidance. Are we eligible if we are operating with the no-cost extension funds for Fall 2018? If not, what is your recommendation?	Yes, all grantees with active THECB contracts are eligible to apply.

2018-2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2018 CRSM)

	Questions	Answers
33	I wanted to address a couple of job titles referenced in the CRSM -2018 RFA. On page 12 of the RFA, section 10.3.6 the "Program Director" is referenced as a coordinator for all aspects of the project and can allocate up to 10% total of the grant award. Then below in the Budget section, section 10.5.1, a "Project Director" is mentioned. This person oversees all components of the project and is point person with the THECB. My question is, are these two roles meant to be the same person? Or can the Project Director be separate person in a PT or FT role for the project?	The reference to "Project Director" in both sections of the RFA should be the same person. The person in this position is the main point of contact between the Awarded Applicant and THECB and must be familiar with all components of grant implementation. However, actual work with grant implementation may be done by additional personnel, including project co-director, advisors, facutly members, etc.
34	We currently have the 2016-2018 CRSM 60X30TX Grant. And I had a question about repeating students taking the corequisite courses. I wanted clarification if this is something that has changed from the 1st grant moving into the 2nd RFA. On the current grant, (Section 2.5) the Acceleration student population is "underprepared student enrolled in 1st college level course and DE course/ intervention". For the new RFA, it was mentioned that students who are repeating the corequisite can now be considered eligible as a "completer" for the new RFA. Am I understanding this correctly?	Yes, your understanding is correct. A student who previously attempted a corequisite course and was not successful and re-enrolls in a corequisite course in a future semester during the grant period can be considered for completion funding. However, there was no change regarding this from the previous CRSM RFA to the 2018-CRSM RFA.
35	1. Question on Appendix G Line H Table 1: Must the total amount of Completion Funding (Line H Table 1) NOT exceed the total award amount for only year 1 (50,000-100,000)? 2. Would this be the same case for table 2, Total Projected AY 2 Completion Funding Line? Our AY 1 + AY 2 total is over $110,000, so we want to make sure that works.	The calculations and totals for completion funding for AY's 1 and 2 are independent of the $50,000 - $100,000 initial funding. Pending the number of proposed corequisite completions for AY 1 and the proposed increase in the number of completions in AY 2 from AY 1, the amount of completion funding proposed may exceed the amount of initial funding ($50,000 - $100,000) requested.

	2018-2020 College Readiness and Success Models for 60x30TX (2018 CRSM)	
	Questions	**Answers**
36	1. While we did not see a specific requirement for Letters of Support, we feel it would help explain how the program will be conducted within the institution and demonstrate our leadership's commitment to verifying internal approvals are met to ensure each role involved in this project is properly fulfilled. Are we allowed to include Letters of Support if they are not a specifically listed application component? 2. According to Section 3.2 of the RFA, TAMUK's matching requirement may be waived, as we are an institution that serves low-income/disadvantaged students (we also have the required federal waiver from the Department of Education). Two of the Co-PIs on the project will be holding leadership roles for the activities but will not be including time in the budget. If they will not be including their time in the budget, would we still list their time as "in-kind" within the application budget or is that unallowable as our matching requirement would be waived? • This question ties into the first one, as we feel having a letter(s) explaining that each person involved will be fulfilling their role on the project even if they will not be listing time on the grant budget would better explain how our institution plans to run the project activities internally.	1. No. Letters of Support should not be included as they are not requested as part of the grant application. 2. In cases where the matching requirement may be waived, the applicant may list in-kind personnel in the budget narrative (Section 10.5).